

device directly or indirectly, further introducing or delivering for introduction into interstate commerce or causing such act, any device named "Magnetic Ray Appliance," or "Magnetic Ray Instrument," or any similar device similarly labeled in the manner as the said device.

**884. Misbranding of Compound Syrup of White Pine and Tar, Medical Compound for Women, and VeDor No. 578 Injection. U. S. v. Primrose R. Devore (Drug Products Co.). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$1,500 and 6 months in jail. (F. D. C. No. 7238. Sample Nos. 49046-E, 49048-E, 49049-E.)**

On June 29, 1942, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Ohio filed an information against Primrose R. Devore, trading as Drug Products Co., Columbus, Ohio, alleging shipment on or about June 18 and September 4, 1941, from the State of Ohio into the State of Texas of quantities of the above-named products.

Analysis of a sample of Compound Syrup of White Pine and Tar showed that it consisted essentially of small proportions of ammonium chloride, pine tar, menthol and methyl salicylate, sugar, alcohol, and water. The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the name "Compound Syrup of White Pine And Tar Not U. S. P." was false and misleading as it created the impression that the article was "Compound Syrup of White Pine," recognized in the National Formulary, to which tar had been added; and (2) in that the following statements were false and misleading since the article would not be efficacious for these conditions: "A Combination of Meritorious Ingredients Highly Beneficial in Temporary Pulmonary Conditions Caused by Exposure," and "A Successful Preparation for the Treatment of \* \* \* Ordinary Colds, Bronchial Irritations \* \* \* Temporary Relief for \* \* \* Colds \* \* \* Bronchitis, etc."

Analysis of a sample of the Medical Compound for Women showed that it consisted essentially of extracts of plant drugs, including an alkaloid-bearing drug, sugar, and water, preserved with benzoic acid. The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Medical Compound for Women" was false and misleading as the drug was not efficacious in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of diseases or ailments of women.

Analysis of a sample of VeDor No. 578 Injection showed that it consisted essentially of small proportions of zinc sulfate, lead acetate, and water. The article was alleged to be misbranded (1) in that the statement "Use in connection with Anti-Gon Internal No. 578" was false and misleading since it implied that this article constituted a part of a treatment for gonorrhea and that when used in connection with another drug, Anti-Gon Internal No. 578, it would be efficacious in the treatment of gonorrhea, whereas the article had no value either alone or in conjunction with such other drug in the treatment of that disease; (2) in that the label failed to declare the common name of each active ingredient since zinc sulfate was not declared; and (3) in that it was a drug in package form and the label failed to bear an adequate statement of the quantity of the contents.

On October 21, 1942, the defendant entered a plea of guilty, whereupon the court imposed a fine of \$500 on each of the 3 counts, a total of \$1,500, and 6 months in jail on each of the 3 counts, the jail sentences to run concurrently.

**885. Misbranding of Glucocinine. U. S. v. Eric M. Boehnke (Glucocinine Company of America). Plea of guilty. Fine, \$300 and 4 months in jail. (F. D. C. No. 5581. Sample No. 31575-E.)**

On May 13, 1942, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York filed an information against Eric Boehnke, trading as Glucocinine Co. of America, at Richmond Hill, N. Y., alleging shipment on or about January 23, 1941, from the State of New York into the State of Michigan of a quantity of Glucocinine which was misbranded.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that certain statements in the labeling, and a graph purporting to show the reduction of blood sugar brought about by use of the article in experimental animals, were false and misleading in that they represented and suggested that the article would be efficacious in the treatment of light and medium cases of diabetes mellitus, that it would be efficacious as a preventative of diabetes, that it would act beneficially on the pancreas and would arouse the pancreas to new activity, and that it would be efficacious to clear the urine of sugar and reduce the blood sugar to a negative point, whereas it would not be efficacious for such purposes.

It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statements: "Plant Insulin substances," "Glucocinine \* \* \* is PLANT INSULIN, i. e., substances which occur in large quantities in certain plants and may be regarded as the